

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/718,679	SHOREY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert C. Scheibel	2666	

All Participants:

(1) Robert C. Scheibel.

(2) Frederick Gibb.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 February 2004

Time: 12:45 EST

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

8, 15, 22

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 2-17-05
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner outlined the new matter rejection of claims 8-21 and briefly discussed the reasons the new limitations are being considered new matter. Examiner also indicated that there appears to be allowable subject matter in claim 22. Mr. Gibb consulted with his client and concluded that they would prefer to have the rejections sent in an office action. The objections to drawings 2 and 3 as well as the specification were also briefly discussed during the interview..